Application No. Applicant(s) 10/719,636 SLEIMAN ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner **Art Unit** Sue A. Purvis 1734 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Sue A. Purvis. (2) Chad Kleinheksel. Date of Interview: 08 September 2005. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: _____. Identification of prior art discussed: Sardo - US Patent No. 6,349,755. Agreement with respect to the claims fi was reached. q was not reached. h N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed Sardo and the camera used in Sardo. Applicant pointed out how their invention is different, in part because the imager images the products directly and the processor identifies and labels a target portion of the product. Examiner would have to expand the search upon receipt of an amendment. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required